Evolution increases ecosystem temporal stability and recovery from a flood in grassland communities

Sofia J. van Moorsel[1], Terhi Hahl[1], Owen L. Petchey[1], Anne Ebeling[2], Nico Eisenhauer[3,4], Bernhard Schmid[1] and Cameron Wagg[1*]

[1] URPP Global Change and Biodiversity and Department of Evolutionary Biology and Environmental Studies, University of Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057, Switzerland

[2] Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Jena, Dornburger Str. 159, 07743 Jena, Germany

[3] German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, Deutscher Platz 5e, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

[4] Institute of Biology, Leipzig University, Johannisallee 21, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

[*] Correspondence should be addressed to:

C.W. cameron.wagg@ieu.uzh.ch

Keywords: community evolution | compensatory dynamics | environmental perturbation | flood | grassland biodiversity | recovery | resilience | resistance | stability

Abstract

Understanding factors that increase ecosystem stability is critical in the face of environmental change. Biodiversity plays a key role in buffering ecosystems against disturbances such as extreme climatic events. The evolution of biological communities within their local environment may also increase ecosystem stability and resilience, but this has yet to be tested. Here, we provide evidence for such evolutionary effects using a long-term grassland biodiversity experiment. Communities of plants with a history of co-occurrence (co-selected communities) were temporally more stable at low diversity than the same communities of plants with no such history (naïve communities). Furthermore, co-selected communities exhibited greater recovery following a major flood, resulting in more stable post-flood productivity. These results demonstrate that community evolution can increase ecosystem stability under normal circumstances and in response to extreme disturbance, but also suggest that high diversity can in part compensate for evolutionary naïvety.

Introduction

It has long been recognized that greater biodiversity can stabilize ecosystem functioning[1–5]. Such findings emphasize the importance of biodiversity for maintaining ecosystem functioning under future anticipated extreme climatic events[6,7]. The positive effect of biodiversity on maintaining ecosystem productivity over many years can be attributed to greater temporal stability and improved resistance, recovery and resilience to environmental disturbances[4,8,9]. Greater resistance increases ecosystem stability by reducing the loss in productivity[10], while greater recovery increases the amount of productivity that the ecosystem can regain after the disturbance-induced loss[11]. Together resistance and recovery determine ecosystem resilience as we define it here, namely how ecosystem productivity differs between pre- and post-disturbance states[12]. Consequently, how plant diversity stabilizes ecosystem productivity through mediating ecosystem resistance, recovery and resilience has become a focal question in ecology[3,4,9,10,13,14].

Many of the underlying mechanisms by which diversity stabilizes ecosystem productivity are based on the inherent differences among species in their niche requirements and life strategies[15–19]. For instance, different plant species may exhibit high performance under different environmental conditions (termed response diversity). Consequently, a greater plant diversity may stabilize ecosystem productivity under normally fluctuating environmental conditions and especially under environmental disturbance, because there is a higher probability that some species may perform well at any given time point. Asynchrony of species performances, derived from interspecific differences in responses to environmental variation, can thus allow more diverse ecosystems to resist more or recover faster to maintain performance, often referred to as the insurance or portfolio effect[16–18].

Species asynchrony has been conceptually and empirically demonstrated as a mechanism by which biodiversity can stabilize ecosystem productivity[16,18,20–23].

There are a number of community and population attributes associated with ecosystem stability. Ecosystem resistance, recovery and resilience that underlie stability may be dependent upon plant diversity[4,13], plant density[24] and plant functional traits[25]. However, we lack information about the importance of evolutionary processes that may be occurring over the same temporal scales across which ecosystem stability is measured[26]. So far, evolutionary mechanisms underlying the biodiversity–stability relationship have been considered in terms of phylogenetic relatedness that reflects evolutionary mechanisms over broad time scales[27,28]. It remains unclear whether evolution over short time scales can increase the stability of communities under normally fluctuating environmental conditions as well as in response to extreme climatic events by potentially improving resistance, recovery or resilience. Such evolution leading to changes at the community level is referred to as community evolution[29], but so far has almost exclusively been studied in microbial ecosystems[30–32].

Here we test the hypothesis that short-term community evolution in grassland ecosystems will affect ecosystem stability and that this effect may depend on plant diversity, which was experimentally manipulated. This hypothesis is based on community evolution increasing niche differentiation[26], and niche differentiation having the potential to affect community biomass[29], population variability, and population synchrony, all of which contribute to ecosystem stability. We measured ecosystem stability as temporal variation in primary productivity during normal environmental fluctuations. Furthermore, we measured ecosystem responses to disturbance by an extreme event, a naturally occurring major flood, as resistance,

recovery, resilience and post-disturbance stability of productivity[33]. We compared co-selected communities with naïve communities of 1, 2, 4 or 8 plant species. Co-selected communities were assembled with offspring from individuals that had co-occurred in the same communities over 8 years. Naïve communities were assembled with individuals that were obtained from the same supplier that provided the original seeds at the beginning of the 8-year selection period of the co-selected communities[26,29]. To take into account the importance of the local environment, plant communities were planted in their home soil ("native") or a sterilized soil that was inoculated with either their native soil biota ("inoculated") or with soil biota from a different field ("neutral"). Co-selected and naïve communities were grown from 2012–2015 at the field site in Jena, Germany. Productivity was measured in May of each year and in August of 2012–2014.

Results

Temporal stability, asynchrony and population variation

Community evolution significantly modified the diversity–stability relationship and the diversity–population variation relationship (interaction plant history x species richness in Table 1). Stability more strongly increased with diversity in the naïve than in the co-selected communities (Fig. 1a). Conversely, population variation increased more strongly with diversity in the co-selected than in the naïve communities. Species asynchrony significantly increased with diversity (main effect of species richness in Table 1). Different soil treatments did not alter the diversity–stability relationship (Fig. 1b) and generally, the community-evolution treatments and soil treatments did not affect stability, asynchrony and population variation (Table 1).

The different diversity–stability relationships between the two community-

112 evolution treatments were related to different asynchrony and stability relationships.
113 That is, asynchrony of species-level productivity fluctuations was less positively
114 correlated with ecosystem stability in co-selected than in naïve communities or, in
115 other words, community evolution significantly reduced the coupling between
116 species-level asynchrony and ecosystem stability (Fig. 1c). In contrast to the altered
117 relationship between asynchrony and stability, community evolution did not alter the
118 relationship between population variation and stability (Fig. 1d).
119
120 *Responses to an extreme flood event*
121 A naturally occurring flood in early summer 2013 had devastating effects on
122 the plant communities and reduced productivity in the corresponding time interval
123 (Fig. 2). Whereas diversity had no general effect on resistance to the flood, the
124 diversity–resistance relationships differed significantly between the two community-
125 evolution treatments (Table 2). This resulted from the co-selected communities
126 having a generally lower resistance at high diversity (Fig. 3a; Table 2). Native and
127 inoculated soil treatments resulted in highest resistance to the flood, in particular at
128 high diversity (Fig. 3b).
129 Ecosystem recovery following the flood was independently increased by
130 diversity and by community evolution, but soil treatments had no significant effects
131 (Fig. 3c, d; Table 2). At low (but not at high) diversity, co-selected communities were
132 more resilient (Fig. 3e). On the other hand, similar to temporal stability, high diversity
133 could compensate for the reduced resilience of naïve as compared with co-selected
134 communities (marginally significant interaction plant history x species richness in
135 Table 2). The effect of species richness on resilience was strongest on the soil that
136 was inoculated with native soil because of the very low resilience of the

137 corresponding monocultures (Fig. 3f; Table 2). Species turnover was not influenced
138 by community-evolution or soil treatments, but did increase with species richness
139 (Fig. S1; Table S1). Whereas before the flood, co-selected and naïve communities
140 were equally stable (Fig. 4a), the flood event significantly destabilized post-flood
141 productivity in the naïve compared with the co-selected communities (Fig. 4b; Table
142 S2).
143
144 **Discussion**
145 The potential for greater diversity to maintain a greater ecosystem functioning
146 over time has been well recognized[1–5]. Additionally, the positive effects of
147 biodiversity on ecosystem functioning have been shown to strengthen over time[34–36].
148 Such changes in the functioning of plant communities may reflect evolutionary
149 processes that occur over the same temporal scales across which ecosystem stability is
150 being measured. For instance, there is evidence that such temporal changes in the
151 functioning of communities may reflect rapid evolutionary increases in species
152 complementarity and community productivity[26,29,32]. Yet the importance of the
153 interactive effects of biodiversity and community evolution for ecosystem stability
154 has not been tested so far. Our study provides strong evidence that community
155 evolution maintained a more stable primary productivity at low diversity, which
156 consequently altered the diversity–stability relationship under normally fluctuating
157 environmental conditions. Furthermore, we found that co-selected communities had
158 an overall greater recovery and post-perturbation stability following a naturally
159 occurring extreme climatic event. In comparison to the plant diversity and
160 community-evolution treatments, treatments simulating co-selected vs. novel soil
161 microbial communities only had minor effects on ecosystem stability. Overall, our

findings demonstrate the potential importance of community-wide evolutionary processes for maintaining ecosystem functioning and highlights the need to further consider the integration of evolutionary processes in understanding biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationships.

Several mechanisms could have led to the observed differences between co-selected and naïve communities. First, the changes at community level could have been due to altered species abundance distributions. However, this would have had to be related to changed performances of species due to community evolution, because co-selected and naïve communities only differed in regard to selection history but not with regard to initial species composition or environment. Furthermore, we could not detect any significant changes in species abundance distributions. This leaves a second explanation for the observed community-level effects, phenotypic changes within species. Such changes could have a genetic or other heritable basis such as epigenetic or maternal carry-over effects[37]. The latter are unlikely because the communities were started from seeds rather than cuttings and the effects were observed over a 4-year time span. We tested in a separate study using a reduced-representation bisulfate sequencing method[38] for five of the 60 species from the Jena Experiment if selection on the field site led to genetic or epigenetic changes and found evidence for genetic but not for epigenetic changes[39]. These genetic changes could have been due to differential mortality, growth or reproduction among the initially sown genotypes[40], recombination during sexual reproduction in the field or the experimental garden or, presumably least likely, to mutation and selection, all occurring before the start of the present experiment.

Stability, synchrony and population variation

Numerous studies have shown that biodiversity increases ecosystem stability due to the effects of species asynchrony in diverse communities, allowing high compensatory population variation to be combined with low community-level variation over time[15,17,22,41]. Here we also observed such compensatory dynamics, but this was significantly modified by community evolution. We found that the positive diversity–stability relationship was stronger in naïve plant communities where species did not share a common selection history. While this positive diversity–stability relationship in these naïve plant communities provides further support for the notion that diversity is a key component underlying ecosystem stability, it also indicates that the effects of plant diversity on stability may be particularly strong in newly assembled plant communities. The weaker effect of diversity on stability in the co-selected communities was due to greater stability at lower diversity in comparison to the naïve plant communities. These findings suggested that the evolutionary history of co-occurring species compensated for lower biodiversity by exhibiting a more stable productivity and, conversely, that biodiversity in naïve communities could partly compensate for a lack of evolutionarily increased ecosystem stability.

The modified diversity–stability relationship between the co-selected and naïve plant communities may at least in part have been due to the dampening effect of community evolution on the positive relationship between species asynchrony and stability. As expected, species asynchrony increased stability overall. However, in co-selected communities, species asynchrony was less positively associated with stability, indicating community evolution led to a partial decoupling of asynchrony and stability and thus allowed for higher stability at low diversity compared with naïve communities. More specifically, in communities where species synchrony was

high, such as in less diverse communities, co-selected plant communities were generally more stable than naïve plant communities. At low diversity, species in co-selected communities compared with species in naïve communities were also generally less temporally variable in their productivity (see significant interaction plant history x species richness in Table 1). Therefore, the co-selected plant communities with low asynchrony were able to maintain greater community stability. On the other hand, the stronger coupling between asynchrony and stability allowed naïve compared with co-selected communities to have a more stable productivity at high diversity, where species fluctuated more asynchronously through time.

The reduced temporal stability at low synchrony in our co-selected plant communities (see Fig. 1c) may be due to the effect of community evolution on species competitive interactions. For instance, it has been previously shown that more diverse communities can result in the selection for characteristics by which individuals avoid competition and exhibit greater complementarity[26,29]. Such changes in species interactions can impact species dynamics and ultimately the stability of the net community productivity. This is because species competing more strongly with one another can exhibit greater asynchrony in their temporal performance since temporal variations in the environment may temporarily favor the competitive advantage of one species over another resulting in their negative temporal covariance[15,20,41]. Such destabilizing effects of evolution have been demonstrated in microalgae communities where a greater phylogenetic distance among community members results in weaker competitive interactions, that in turn reduces the competition-driven temporal asynchrony among species and the compensatory dynamics that are required to stabilize the net productivity of the communities[28].

235 The interactions between plants and their soil communities are well known to
236 influence ecosystem functioning[43] and these interactions likely change over ecological
237 time-scales[44–46]. We therefore anticipated that soils would play an important role in
238 ecosystem stability. However, we found little evidence that our soil treatments
239 influenced the temporal performance of plant communities under field conditions and
240 did not have any interactive effects with the community-evolution treatments on the
241 temporal performance of the plant communities. However, we did observe that the
242 soils influenced the pre-flood productivity of the plant communities. In particular, we
243 found that the pre-flood productivity was generally lower in communities grown in
244 native soil, which might have been due to a greater density of antagonistic soil biota
245 or the inoculated soils may have had a greater pool of available soil resources
246 resulting from the soil sterilization process[47]. The difference between inoculated and
247 native soils was, perhaps literally, "washed away" by the flood event. The flood event
248 may thus have equalized the soil properties among soil treatments and consequently
249 dampened any potential plant–soil interactions that have been observed elsewhere to
250 influence ecosystem stability[48,49].
251
252 *Responses to an extreme flood event*
253 Our study system was exposed to a naturally occurring extreme flood event
254 that strongly reduced the productivity of the plant communities[50]. Here we took
255 advantage of this to further assess the hypothesis that community evolution may
256 enhance ecosystem stability in response to disturbance events, due to greater
257 resistance, recovery or resilience. Biodiversity decreased resistance, confirming
258 previous findings[11,24], but the relationship was context-dependent. Community
259 evolution reduced resistance to flooding at high diversity (see Fig. 3a). This lower

resistance can be attributed to greater pre-flood productivity of the co-selected communities. In this sense, co-selected communities had "more to lose" when faced with this extreme climate event, an observation reported also in other grassland systems in response to drought[11]. Thus, overall the reduced productivity of naïve communities resulted in less absolute loss in productivity due to the flood and their greater resistance. It was previously shown that selection for niche differentiation results in higher community productivity[26]. Our results indicate that the selection-driven increase in productivity may consequently reduce the resistance to extreme climate events at higher levels of diversity. However, the greater productivity of co-selected plant communities may have also allowed them to recover back to their pre-disturbed state and maintain a more stable post-flood productivity. This is supported by our analysis using pre-flood productivity as a covariate (see Supporting Information, Fig. S2, Table S3). Once we corrected for the pre-flood productivity, species richness increased resilience in both co-selected and naïve communities, and we observed a strong interactive effect of community evolution and species richness for ecosystem resistance (Table 2).

Biodiversity had a strong positive effect on the recovery and, in the naïve communities also on resilience of the plant communities, paralleling numerous other studies emphasizing the importance of biodiversity for ecosystem recovery and resilience[4,11,12,26]. In addition, community evolution further increased recovery and resilience (see Fig. 3c, e). The positive effect of community evolution on post-flood recovery suggests that the local environment may have acted as a selective filter on these plant communities. The ancestral communities of the co-selected plants were initially sown into the field site in 2002, which is a natural floodplain where the plant communities were exposed to environmental conditions related to soil moisture

285 saturation at previous milder flood events in winter 2003 and winter 2005 (personal
286 communication with C. Roscher) than the one in 2013 and thus selection likely
287 favored individuals with traits that allowed them to perform well under such
288 conditions and recover more rapidly[51]. It has also been shown that community
289 evolution can result in increased plant species complementarity in this system[26]. In
290 line with this, the result that community evolution in these plant communities resulted
291 in greater recovery may be suggestive of selection for greater facilitative effects after
292 the perturbation as may be anticipated under the stress-gradient hypothesis[53].

293 The greater recovery in the co-selected communities also resulted in a greater
294 resilience up to a diversity level of 4 species and was followed by an increased post-
295 flood stability compared with naïve communities. This means that community
296 evolution aided the return of the functioning of these communities to their pre-
297 perturbed state and their pre-perturbation temporal performance. Our results
298 demonstrate that community evolution can have strong effects on altering the
299 population- and community-level mechanisms underpinning increased stability in
300 ecosystem productivity, specifically mechanisms relating synchrony, recovery, and
301 resilience. Finally, it is important to note that the greater post-flood stability in our
302 study was not due to compositional changes as indicated by the similar compositional
303 turnover between naïve and co-selected plant communities. Thus, the increased
304 resistance and post-flood stability can be attributed to the greater recovery and post-
305 flood performance of the individual species functioning in concert. We suggest that
306 genetic changes within the species comprising the co-selected communities were
307 responsible for the increased stability. In a study comparing plant individuals within
308 species from different selection backgrounds in the Jena Experiment (high vs. low
309 diversity), we did not find evidence for epigenetic divergence, but a strong genetic

signal[39]. Likely two different evolutionary processes — co-selection between the species within each particular community composition and "diffuse" co-selection among all species within the community — have improved the species' abilities to function more complementarily with other species in the community[26,29].

Conclusions

Our findings show that ecosystem stability and recovery can not only be promoted by biodiversity but also by evolutionary processes in plant communities over the time scales at which stability is being measured. In particular, we found that community evolution can enhance the stability of ecosystem productivity when diversity is low, whereas in the absence of community evolution a greater diversity was more critical for increasing stability. The community evolution-driven increase in ecosystem stability and recovery was likely linked to the selection on individual plant characteristics that facilitated greater recovery in these plant communities. If evolution in grassland communities increases ecosystem resilience and stability, maintaining co-selected plant communities could be a crucial precaution under global change and increased frequency of extreme climatic events[6,7]. Furthermore, integrating evolutionary processes into the temporal changes in biodiversity–ecosystem functioning relationships is likely to be a promising future avenue for predicting how ecosystems may respond to climatic extremes and biodiversity loss.

Methods

Field site. This study was conducted at the Jena Experiment field site (Jena, Thuringia, Germany, 51 ˚N, 11 ˚E, 135 m a.s.l.) from 2011 to 2015. The Jena Experiment is a long-term biodiversity field experiment located on the banks of the Saale River. In 78 experimental field plots of different diversity levels, 60 central European grassland species are grown in a number of species combinations since 2002[54].

Community-evolution treatments. This study included eleven monocultures, twelve 2-species mixtures, twelve 4-species mixtures and twelve 8-species mixtures for a total of 47 experimental plots. We used two community-evolution treatments: plants with eight years of shared community selection in these experimental plots (co-selected communities) and plants without a common selection history in the Jena Experiment (naïve communities). The naïve plant seeds without a common selection history were obtained from the same commercial seed supplier (Rieger Hofmann GmbH, in Blaufelden-Raboldshausen, Germany) who provided the seeds used for the establishment of the original Jena Experiment plant communities[54]. The supplied seeds originated from various field sites in Germany and have been cultivated by reseeding every year for at least five years in monoculture. Seeds of co-selected communities were produced in an experimental garden in Zurich, Switzerland, from cuttings that had been made in the Jena Experiment. The cuttings were planted in Zürich in the original species combination in plots fenced with plastic netting to reduce pollination between communities[26]. A small number of seeds were additionally collected directly in the plots of the Jena Experiment. The "selected" seeds were thus offspring of plant populations that had been sown in 2002 and grown until 2010 in plots of the Jena Experiment.

357 In January 2011, the seeds of co-selected and naïve communities were
358 germinated in potting soil (BF4, De Baat; Holland) in a glasshouse in Zurich.
359 Subsequently, the seedlings were transported back to the Jena Experiment field site
360 and transplanted into 2 x 2 m subplots of the original plots (in March 2011). There
361 were four 1 x 1 m quadrats with different soil treatments in each subplot (see next
362 section) and each quadrat was split into two 1 x 0.5 m halves ("half-quadrats"). We
363 planted seedlings of co-selected communities into one half and seedlings of naïve
364 communities into the other half of each quadrat in a hexagonal pattern at a density of
365 210 plants per m^2 with a 6-cm distance between individuals. We planted the species in
366 equal proportions, but five species were excluded from both co-selected and naïve
367 communities because they were no longer present in the original plot of the Jena
368 Experiment. After transplanting, the seedlings received water every second day for six
369 weeks.
370
371 **Soil treatments**. Within each 2 x 2 m subplot of the 47 plots of the Jena Experiment,
372 we removed the original plant cover in September 2010 and used it for the plant
373 propagation in the experimental garden in Zurich (see previous section).
374 Subsequently, we excavated the soil to a depth of 0.35 m, added a 10-cm layer of sand
375 to the bottom of the plots and covered it with a 0.5 mm mesh net. We separated the
376 borders of the subplots and the quadrats by plastic frames. The excavated native soil
377 from each of the plots was sieved and four soil treatments were prepared. Half of the
378 soil (approximately 600 kg per plot) was γ-irradiated to remove the original soil biota.
379 Half of this sterilized soil was then inoculated with 4% (by weight) of live sugar-beet
380 soil and 4% of sterilized native soil of the corresponding plot ("neutral soil" obtained
381 by inoculation). Live sugar-beet soil was added to create a neutral soil community and

was previously collected in an agricultural sugar-beet field not associated with the Jena Experiment, but with comparable soil properties. The second half of the sterilized soil was inoculated with 4% (by weight) of live sugar-beet soil and 4% of live native soil of the corresponding plot ("native soil" obtained by inoculation). The non-sterilized part of the excavated soil was used for the second two soil treatments. Half of this soil was filled back into one quadrat of the corresponding plot ("native soil"). The other half of the unsterilized soil was mixed among all plots and filled into the remaining quadrats. However, this fourth soil treatment was abandoned after two years, which is why this treatment is not included here.

The soils were left to rest in closed bags to allow for the soil chemistry to equalize and to encourage soil biota of the inocula to colonize the sterilized soil before planting. The soils were then added into the quadrats in December 2010 and all quadrats were covered with a net and a water permeable black sheet to avoid spilling between quadrats until seedling transplantation in March 2011.

Sampling of aboveground biomass. The test communities were weeded three times a year and the plants were cut to three cm above ground twice a year at typical grassland harvest times (late May and August) in central Europe. Plant material from a 50 x 20 cm area in the centre of each half-quadrat was collected to measure aboveground biomass. We sorted the biomass into species, dried it at 70°C and weighed the dried biomass. There were four May harvests (2012–2015) and three August harvest (2012–2015) because the experiment was terminated after the fourth May harvest in 2015.

Natural flood event. In June 2013, the field site was flooded due to heavy rains in

central Europe[50,55]. The flood duration (maximum 25 days) and depth of water (maximum of 40 cm) was variable among plots and quadrats due to small topographical differences among the plots in the experiment[25]. The variation in flooding severity was distributed across the diversity gradient and within subplots the quadrats and half-quadrats experienced the same flooding severity. We tested whether flood severity[50] influenced the diversity–stability relationship and any other of our dependent variables (data not shown). This was not the case, which made us exclude these indices in all analyses.

Data analysis. We first calculated the stability of ecosystem functioning as the inverse coefficient of variation (CV_{com}^{-1}) in the net community biomass over six time points. We excluded the flooding time point to avoid any confounding effects of the dramatic biomass loss in response to the flood. The stability of a single community is thus the mean net community biomass (μ_{com}) divided by its standard deviation (σ_{com}). To explain the change in stability with biodiversity and between the community-evolution treatments we split the community-level variation across the six harvests (CV_{com}) into its two component parts, these being the weighted population variation (CV_{pop}) and the species synchrony (θ) that are defined elsewhere[18,22]. Variation in these indices of stability, synchrony and population stability was analyzed with linear mixed-effects models. Fixed-effects terms were plant species richness (log scale), community-evolution treatment (plant history co-selected vs. naïve) and soil treatment (native, inoculated and neutral soil); subplots and quadrats were used as random-effects terms to get appropriate errors for significance tests[56].

We calculated the resistance, recovery and resilience (see Fig. 2) to assess the communities' responses to the flood event. Resistance is the change in productivity

between the average of the three harvests prior to the flood and the productivity during the flood event, more negative values indicating lower resistance. Recovery is the difference in the biomass produced post-flood (averaged over the three post-flood harvests) from the biomass produced during the flood event, where positive values indicate the amount of biomass recovered. Resilience is the difference between the pre- and post-flood biomasses where positive values indicate communities that were more productive after than before the flood event, whereas negative values indicate that the post-flood productivity had not returned to its pre-flood state. Variation in resistance, recovery and resilience was analyzed with linear mixed-effects models. Fixed-effects terms were plant species richness (log scale), community-evolution treatment (plant history co-selected vs. naïve) and soil treatment (native, inoculated and neutral soil); subplots and quadrats were used as random-effects terms. Since the measures of resistance, recovery and resilience can be dependent upon the magnitude of the pre-flood productivity[24,57], we created additional models which included the pre-flood productivity as a covariate (see Supporting Information).

We calculated the species compositional turnover between pre- and post-flood conditions. Because it includes species abundances, we used the Bray-Curtis dissimilarity between pre-flood abundances of species (averaged over the three pre-flood harvests) and the post-flood abundances of species (averaged over the three post-flood harvests). The analysis was the same as for the resistance, recovery and resilience measures. We also analyzed pre-flood (three harvests before the flooding event) and post-flood (three harvests after the flooding event) stability in the same way as described at the beginning of this section.

455 All analyses were conducted using the software R, version 3.2.4[58]. Mixed
456 models using residual maximum likelihood (REML) were fitted using the package
457 ASReml for R[59] and the package 'Pascal' available at GitHub[56].
458
459 **References**
460
461 1. Tilman, D., Reich, P. B. & Knops, J. M. H. Biodiversity and ecosystem stability
462 in a decade-long grassland experiment. *Nature* **441,** 629–632 (2006).
463 2. Proulx, R. *et al.* Diversity promotes temporal stability across levels of ecosystem
464 organization in experimental grasslands. *PLoS ONE* **5,** e13382 (2010).
465 3. Tilman, D. & Downing, J. A. Biodiversity and stability in grasslands. *Nature* **367,**
466 363–365 (1994).
467 4. Isbell, F. *et al.* Biodiversity increases the resistance of ecosystem productivity to
468 climate extremes. *Nature* **526,** 574–577 (2015).
469 5. Schläpfer, F. & Schmid, B. Ecosystem effects of biodiversity: a classification of
470 hypotheses and exploration of empirical results. *Ecol. Appl.* **9,** 893–912 (1999).
471 6. Stocker, T. F. *et al.* Technical summary IPCC 2013. in *Climate Change 2013: The*
472 *Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment*
473 *Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* 33–115 (Cambridge
474 University Press, 2013).
475 7. Rockström, J. *et al.* A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* **461**, 472–475
476 (2009).
477 8. Oliver, T. H. *et al.* Biodiversity and resilience of ecosystem functions. *Trends*
478 *Ecol. Evol.* **30,** 673–684 (2015).

9. Wagg, C. *et al.* Plant diversity maintains long-term ecosystem productivity under frequent drought by increasing short-term variation. *Ecology* **98,** 2952–2961 (2017).

10. Caldeira, M. C., Hector, A., Loreau, M. & Pereira, J. S. Species richness, temporal variability and resistance of biomass production in a Mediterranean grassland. *Oikos* **110,** 115–123 (2005).

11. Van Ruijven, J. & Berendse, F. Diversity enhances community recovery, but not resistance, after drought. *J. Ecol.* **98,** 81–86 (2009).

12. Lloret, F., Keeling, E. G. & Sala, A. Components of tree resilience: effects of successive low-growth episodes in old ponderosa pine forests. *Oikos* **120,** 1909–1920 (2011).

13. Hautier, Y. *et al.* Anthropogenic environmental changes affect ecosystem stability via biodiversity. *Science* **348,** 336–340 (2015).

14. Gross, K. *et al.* Species richness and the temporal stability of biomass production: a new analysis of recent biodiversity experiments. *Am. Nat.* **183,** 1–12 (2014).

15. Tilman, D., Lehman, C. L. & Bristow, C. E. Diversity-stability relationships: statistical inevitability or ecological consequence? *Am. Nat.* **151,** 277–282 (1998).

16. Yachi, S. & Loreau, M. Biodiversity and ecosystem productivity in a fluctuating environment: the insurance hypothesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **96,** 1463–1468 (1999).

17. Hector, A. *et al.* General stabilizing effects of plant diversity on grassland productivity through population asynchrony and overyielding. *Ecology* **91,** 2213–2220 (2010).

18. Thibaut, L. M. & Connolly, S. R. Understanding diversity-stability relationships: towards a unified model of portfolio effects. *Ecol. Lett.* **16,** 140–150 (2013).

19. Isbell, F. *et al.* High plant diversity is needed to maintain ecosystem services. *Nature* **477,** 199–202 (2011).

20. Gonzalez, A. & Loreau, M. The causes and consequences of compensatory dynamics in ecological communities. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* **40,** 393–414 (2009).

21. Loreau, M., Mouquet, N. & Gonzalez, A. Biodiversity as spatial insurance in heterogeneous landscapes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **100,** 12765–12770 (2003).

22. de Mazancourt, C. *et al.* Predicting ecosystem stability from community composition and biodiversity. *Ecol. Lett.* **16,** 617–625 (2013).

23. Leary, D. J. & Petchey, O. L. Testing a biological mechanism of the insurance hypothesis in experimental aquatic communities *J. of Anim. Ecol.* **78,** 1143–1151 (2009).

24. Pfisterer, A. B. & Schmid, B. Diversity-dependent production can decrease the stability of ecosystem functioning. *Nature* **416,** 84–86 (2002).

25. Fischer, F. M. *et al.* Plant species richness and functional traits affect community stability after a flood event. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **371,** 20150276 (2016).

26. Zuppinger-Dingley, D. *et al.* Selection for niche differentiation in plant communities increases biodiversity effects. *Nature* **515,** 108–111 (2014).

27. Cadotte, M. W., Dinnage, R. & Tilman, D. Phylogenetic diversity promotes ecosystem stability. *Ecology* **93,** S223–S233 (2012).

28. Venail, P. A., Alexandrou, M. A., Oakley, T. H. & Cardinale, B. J. Shared ancestry influences community stability by altering competitive interactions: evidence from a laboratory microcosm experiment using freshwater green algae. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **280,** 20131548–20131548 (2013).

529 29. van Moorsel, S. J. *et al.* Community evolution increases plant productivity at low
530 diversity. *Ecol. Lett.* **21,** 128–137 (2018).
531 30. Fiegna, F., Moreno-Letelier, A., Bell, T. & Barraclough, T. G. Evolution of
532 species interactions determines microbial community productivity in new
533 environments. *ISME J.* **9,** 1235–1245 (2014).
534 31. Fiegna, F., Scheuerl, T., Moreno-Letelier, A., Bell, T. & Barraclough, T. G.
535 Saturating effects of species diversity on life-history evolution in bacteria. *Proc.*
536 *R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **282,** 20151794 (2015).
537 32. Lawrence, D. *et al.* Species interactions alter evolutionary responses to a novel
538 environment. *PLoS Biol.* **10,** e1001330 (2012).
539 33. Garssen, A. G., Baattrup-Pedersen, A., Voesenek, L. A. C. J., Verhoeven, J. T. A.
540 & Soons, M. B. Riparian plant community responses to increased flooding: a
541 meta-analysis. *Glob. Change Biol.* **21,** 2881–2890 (2015).
542 34. Cardinale, B. J. *et al.* Impacts of plant diversity on biomass production increase
543 through time because of species complementarity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **104,**
544 18123–18128 (2007).
545 35. Reich, P. B. *et al.* Impacts of biodiversity loss escalate through time as
546 redundancy fades. *Science* **336,** 589–592 (2012).
547 36. Meyer, S. T. *et al.* Effects of biodiversity strengthen over time as ecosystem
548 functioning declines at low and increases at high biodiversity. *Ecosphere* **7,**
549 e01619 (2016).
550 37. Verhoeven, K. J. F., vonHoldt, B. M. & Sork, V. L. Epigenetics in ecology and
551 evolution: what we know and what we need to know. *Mol. Ecol.* **25,** 1631–1638
552 (2016).

553 38. van Gurp, T. P. *et al.* epiGBS: reference-free reduced representation bisulfite
554 sequencing. *Nat. Methods* **13,** 322–324 (2016).
555 39. van Moorsel, S. J. Community evolution increases ecosystem functioning and
556 stability. (University of Zurich, 2017).
557 40. Barrett, R. & Schluter, D. Adaptation from standing genetic variation. *Trends*
558 *Ecol. Evol.* **23,** 38–44 (2008).
559 41. Isbell, F. I., Polley, H. W. & Wilsey, B. J. Biodiversity, productivity and the
560 temporal stability of productivity: patterns and processes. *Ecol. Lett.* **12,** 443–451
561 (2009).
562 42. Loreau, M. & de Mazancourt, C. Species synchrony and its drivers: Neutral and
563 nonneutral community dynamics in fluctuating environments. *Am. Nat.* **172,** E48–
564 E66 (2008).
565 43. van der Putten, W. H. *et al.* Plant-soil feedbacks: the past, the present and future
566 challenges. *J. Ecol.* **101,** 265–276 (2013).
567 44. Lau, J. A. & Lennon, J. T. Rapid responses of soil microorganisms improve plant
568 fitness in novel environments. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **109,** 14058–14062 (2012).
569 45. terHorst, C. P., Lennon, J. T. & Lau, J. A. The relative importance of rapid
570 evolution for plant-microbe interactions depends on ecological context. *Proc. R.*
571 *Soc. B Biol. Sci.* **281,** 20140028–20140028 (2014).
572 46. Zuppinger-Dingley, D., Flynn, D. F. B., De Deyn, G. B., Petermann, J. S. &
573 Schmid, B. Plant selection and soil legacy enhance long-term biodiversity effects.
574 *Ecology* **97,** 918–928 (2016).
575 47. Gebremikael, M. T., De Waele, J., Buchan, D., Soboksa, G. E. & De Neve, S. The
576 effect of varying gamma irradiation doses and soil moisture content on

577 nematodes, the microbial communities and mineral nitrogen. *Appl. Soil Ecol.* **92,**
578 1–13 (2015).
579 48. Yang, G. *et al.* The interaction between arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and soil
580 phosphorus availability influences plant community productivity and ecosystem
581 stability. *J. Ecol.* **102,** 1072–1082 (2014).
582 49. Pellkofer, S., van der Heijden, M. G. A., Schmid, B. & Wagg, C. Soil
583 communities promote temporal stability and species asynchrony in experimental
584 grassland communities. *PLoS ONE* **11,** e0148015 (2016).
585 50. Wright, A. J. *et al.* Flooding disturbances increase resource availability and
586 productivity but reduce stability in diverse plant communities. *Nat. Commun.* **6,**
587 6092 (2015).
588 51. Wright, A. J. *et al.* Plants are less negatively affected by flooding when growing
589 in species-rich plant communities. *New Phytol.* **213,** 645–656 (2017).
590 52. Loeuille, N. Influence of evolution on the stability of ecological communities:
591 Evolution and stability of communities. *Ecol. Lett.* **13,** 1536–1545 (2010).
592 53. Callaway, R. M. *et al.* Positive interactions among alpine plants increase with
593 stress. *Nature* **417,** 844 (2002).
594 54. Roscher, C. *et al.* The role of biodiversity for element cycling and trophic
595 interactions: an experimental approach in a grassland community. *Basic Appl.*
596 *Ecol.* **5,** 107–121 (2004).
597 55. Blöschl, G., Nester, T., Komma, J., Parajka, J. & Perdigão, R. A. P. The June
598 2013 flood in the Upper Danube Basin, and comparisons with the 2002, 1954 and
599 1899 floods. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci.* **17,** 5197–5212 (2013).
600 56. Schmid, B., Baruffol, M., Wang, Z. & Niklaus, P. A. A guide to analyzing
601 biodiversity experiments. *J. Plant Ecol.* **10,** 91–110 (2017).

602 57. Wang, Y., Yu, S. & Wang, J. Biomass-dependent susceptibility to drought in
603 experimental grassland communities. *Ecol. Lett.* **10,** 401–410 (2007).
604 58. R Development Core Team. *R: a language and environment for statistical*
605 *computing.* (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2017).
606 59. Butler, D. *asreml: asmrel() fits the linear mixed model.* (VSNI International,
607 2009).

608

609 **Additional information**

610

611 **Supplementary information** is available for this paper online.

612 **Data availability.** Data for this study are available from the corresponding author and
613 will be made publicly available upon acceptance on the Pangaea repository.

614 **Code availability.** All R scripts are available upon request from the corresponding
615 author C.W.

616

617 **Acknowledgements**

618 Thanks to Debra Zuppinger-Dingley, Dan Flynn and Varuna Yadav for the
619 establishment of the experimental plots. Thanks to the Jena Experiment for providing
620 infrastructure and help and to D. Trujillo and M. Furler for technical assistance. This
621 study was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (grant numbers
622 130720, 147092 and 166457 to B.S.) and the University Research Priority Program
623 Global Change and Biodiversity of the University of Zurich. The Jena Experiment is
624 funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research
625 Foundation, FOR1451).

626

627 **Author contributions**

628 B.S. designed research, T.H. and S.J.V.M. performed research; S.J.V.M., C.W. and
629 B.S. analyzed data; S.J.V.M., B.S. and C.W. wrote the paper with substantial
630 contributions of the other authors.

631

632 **Competing interests**

633 The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

634

635 **FIGURES & TABLES**

636



637

638 **Fig. 1 | The biodiversity–stability relationship in response to community-**
639 **evolution and soil treatments. a,** Greater plant diversity is required for greater
640 stability, but more strongly so in naïve communities (plant history x species richness
641 (log-transformed): $F_{1,\ 135.0} = 4.794$, $P = 0.030$). **b,** Different soils did not alter the
642 overall biodiversity–stability relationship (soil treatment x species richness (log-
643 transformed): $F_{2,\ 87.1} = 0.048$, $P = 0.954$). The three soil treatments were: native soil,
644 sterilized soil inoculated with native soil (inoculated) and sterilized soil (neutral).

645 Means and standard errors are shown for each diversity level. **c,** Stability increased
646 with asynchrony strongly for both naïve and selected communities (main effect
647 asynchrony: $F_{1,\ 204.5} = 84.55$, $P = <0.001$) but stability increased more steeply with
648 asynchrony in naïve plant communities than in co-selected communities (plant history
649 x asynchrony interaction: $F_{1,\ 145.8} = 3.93$, $P = 0.049$). **d,** The relationship between
650 stability and population variation was not altered by community evolution (plant
651 history x population CV: $F_{1,\ 160.3} = 1.348$, $P = 0.247$).
652



Fig. 2 | The flood event greatly reduced ecosystem productivity. Points indicate **a**, the average productivity for co-selected and naïve plant communities and **b**, the average productivity for the three soil treatments native soil, sterilized soil inoculated with native soil (inoculated) and sterilized soil (neutral). Resistance is the change in productivity between the average of the three harvests prior to the flood and the productivity during the flood event (label "Flood" on x-axis corresponding to August 2013). Recovery is the change in productivity from this level to the average of the three post-flood harvests. Resilience is the change from the average of the three pre-flood harvests to the average of the three post-flood harvests.



Fig. 3 | **Resistance, recovery and resilience responses to a major flood event.** Biodiversity–resistance relationships are shown in response to **a**, community-evolution and **b**, soil treatments. Biodiversity–recovery relationships are shown in response to **c**, community-evolution and **d**, soil treatments. Biodiversity–resilience relationships are shown in response to **e**, community-evolution and **f**, soil treatments. Means and standard errors are shown for each diversity level.



Fig. 4 | Influence of the community-evolution treatments on stability pre-flood vs. post-flood. Means for each diversity and community-evolution treatment with error bars indicating the model-estimated standard error are shown. **a,** naïve plant communities and co-selected communities were equally stable pre-flood ($F_{1,\ 130.8}$ = 1.54, P = 0.217). **b,** co-selected plant communities were more stable than naïve plant communities post-flood ($F_{1,\ 131.6}$ = 4.94, P = 0.028). Results are presented on a log-scale.

680 **Table 1 | Mixed-model ANOVA results for stability, population variance and**
681 **synchrony.** The effects of species richness (log-scale), community-evolution (plant
682 history) and soil treatments on the stability of community productivity, population
683 variance and synchrony across the entire experimental period form 2012–2015. The
684 time point of the flooding event was excluded in the calculations of stability,
685 population variance and asynchrony to prevent any confounding effects of the flood.
686 Bold italic text highlights significant effects.

		Stability			Population variance			Asynchrony		
Fixed terms	DF_{num}	DF_{den}	F	P	DF_{den}	F	P	DF_{den}	F	P
Log richness (R_{log})	1	***44.1***	***10.74***	***0.002***	***44.1***	***5.27***	***0.027***	***44.1***	***143***	***<0.001***
Plant history (PH)	1	135	1.805	0.181	135	3.79	0.054	135	0.5	0.479
Soil treatment (SH)	2	87.1	0.641	0.529	87.1	1.3	0.278	87.1	0.87	0.424
PH x R_{log}	1	***135***	***4.794***	***0.030***	***135***	***8.38***	***0.004***	135	0.05	0.830
SH x R_{log}	2	87.2	0.048	0.954	87.2	0.01	0.992	87.2	0.38	0.685
Random terms	N	*Var.* 10^{-3}	*SE* 10^{-3}		*Var.* 10^{-3}	*SE* 10^{-3}		*Var.* 10^{-3}	*SE* 10^{-3}	
Plot	46	100.1	25.9		95.6	23.5		17.9	4.57	
Plot x SH	137	15.5	10.9		13.9	7.4		-0.05	1.96	
Residual	274	92.3	11.23		58.4	7.1		20.02	2.46	

687 *Note*: DF_{num} = numerator degrees of freedom, DF_{den} = denominator degrees of freedom, F =
688 variance ratio, P = probability of type-I error.
689

690 **Table 2 | Mixed effect ANOVA results for resistance, recovery and resilience.** The
691 effects of species richness (log-scale), community-evolution (plant history) and soil
692 treatments are shown for the changes in productivity due to flooding. Bold italic text
693 highlights significant effects.

		Resistance			Recovery			Resilience		
Fixed terms	DF_{num}	DF_{den}	*F*	*P*	DF_{den}	*F*	*P*	DF_{den}	*F*	*P*
Log richness (R_{log})	1	***44.2***	***9.413***	***0.004***	***44.1***	***15.95***	***<0.001***	44.2	1.69	0.200
Plant history (PH)	1	***135***	***4.19***	***0.043***	***135***	***14.5***	***<0.001***	135	3.476	0.064
Soil treatment (SH)	2	***87.3***	***14.07***	***<0.001***	87.2	0.295	0.746	***87.3***	***6.116***	***0.003***
PH x R_{log}	1	***135***	***5.323***	***0.023***	135	0.484	0.488	135	2.65	0.106
SH x R_{log}	2	***87.5***	***5.949***	***0.004***	87.4	1.728	0.184	***87.5***	***6.97***	***0.002***
Random terms	*N*	*Var.*	*SE*		*Var.*	*SE*		*Var.*	*SE*	
Plot	46	3645.1	1073.9		2233.7	771.4		6909.8	2237.8	
Plot x SH	137	775.2	702.4		-157.6	744.9		1933.2	1784.5	
Residual	274	6245.8	760.2		7851.01	955.6		15913.8	1937	

694

695 *Note*: DF_{num} = numerator degrees of freedom, DF_{den} = denominator degrees of freedom, *F* =
696 variance ratio, *P* = probability of type-I error.